

REMARKS

In the **non-final** Office Action mailed February 22, 2010, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 2, 4-14, 17 and 19-30 were pending and rejected claims 1-5, 7, 21 and 25-28 all other claims being withdrawn. In this response no claims have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and, thus, in view of the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 4-14, 17 and 19-30 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 17, 21 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Gorday, U.S. Patent No. 6,665,521 in view of Kotzin, U.S. Patent No. 6,864,501 in further view of Ghimikar, U.S. Patent No. 6,216,001. The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Gorday discusses a system of communicating between a wireless network and a plurality of wireless devices.

Kotzin discusses mobile communications devices including a device having a first radio module removably coupled a second electronics device, having a second radio module removably coupled, the radio modules supporting common radio

communications devices when both of the first and second radio modules are coupled to the same device, and the first and second radio modules supporting radio communications of the first and second devices when coupled.

Ghirnikar discusses service level recognition and registration processing in a wireless communication device.

In contrast the present claims are to method and system used in a communication management unit which on the one hand communicates with the microcircuit cards and on the other hand stores a message intended for an out-of-range microcircuit card.

On page 3 and 4 of the Office Action, it is acknowledged that Gorday and Kotzin do not disclose "storing in said communication management unit a message intended for at least one of said microcircuit cards upon the addressee microcircuit card being temporarily out of the radius of action of the communication management unit," as in claim 1 but asserted that Ghirnikar, col. 4, lines 16-37 does.

Ghirnikar indeed describes a system where messages destined for a wireless communication device may be stored when the device is in a storing service mode and later received by the device when in a full service mode (see abstract of Ghirnikar). In the part cited in the Office Action (col. 4, lines 16-37), the document states: "the message service may store undelivered messages and deliver them at a later time (e.g., upon successful registration by the wireless communication device 120)".

However, the solution proposed by Ghirnikar is intended for networks with several base stations as depicted in Figure 1B. As a consequence, it cannot be known in advance with which base station the wireless communication device (or pager) will communicate (after registration). In this respect, Ghirnikar explains: "all new messages are stored until the pager returns to a full service coverage area" (see col. 6, line 67 through col. 7, line 1). Referring to "a" coverage area (not "the" coverage area) confirms that several base stations and associated area are used.

Therefore Ghirnikar teaches away from the feature of storing messages in the base station effectively communicating with the wireless communication device.

Therefore, even the combination of Ghirnikar with Gorday and Kotzin fails to teach "storing in said communication management unit a message intended" as claimed in claim 1, or "said communication management unit [including] means for storing a message" as per claim 25.

Further, the applicants cannot find where "storing in said communication unit" would be suggested by any of the three documents. Thus, for reasons of compact prosecution the Applicants request that in any future rejection where the current rejection is maintained that this instant feature be pointed out in particular so the Applicants can adequately respond.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Gorday, Kotzin and Ghirnikar, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claims 1 and 25 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 103. It is also submitted that claims 1-14, 17, and 19-23, 25-30 continue to be allowable. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

/James J. Livingston, Jr./
James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg.No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/jr